

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

7 December 2000

Projects Reviewed

Sand Point North Shore Recreation Area
Building 47 Community Center
Jefferson Park Golf Maintenance Facility
Rainier Vista Housing Redevelopment
Southwest Precinct
Municipal Civic Center

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 5:15pm

Commissioners Present

Rick Sundberg
Ralph Cipriani
Jack Mackie
Cary Moon
Donald Royse
Sharon Sutton
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Layne Cubell
Brad Gassman
Sally MacGregor

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Sand Point North Shore Recreation Area**
Phase: Schematic Design
Previous Review: 6 May 1999 (Master Plan Briefing), 9 September 1999 (Briefing), 17 February 2000 (Briefing), 20 July 2000 (Briefing)
Presenters: Diane Hilmo, Sand Point- Magnuson Park- Department of Parks and Recreation
Peter Hummel, Anchor Environmental
Attendees: Kevin Bergsrud, Sand Point- Magnuson Park (DOPAR)
Wendy Ceccherelli, Sand Point- Magnuson Park (DOPAR)
Karen Daubert, Park Board
• Eric Friedli, Sand Point- Magnuson Park (DOPAR)
Mike Usen, EDAW, Inc.
Helen Welborn, City Budget Office
Time: .5 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00059)

Action: The Commission appreciates the presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations:

- suggests that the team develop a means to identify the strengths of each scheme to develop a schematic design for the North Shore Recreation Area
- urges the proponents to incorporate the bio-filtration paving system in the parking area to create a visible experience of the stormwater treatment of the site
- urges the proponents to include the work of an artist, early in this design stage, to enrich the environmental experience of the site and its views; it is important to recognize that there is a significant, internationally-known collection of art work at National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and given the North Shore Recreation Area's proximity, the design team should develop similar opportunities of the same quality and stature for this site
- looks forward to future updates

The Sand Point North Shore Recreation Area is in the upper northwest portion of Sand Point Magnuson Park, bounded by Lake Washington to the north, Sand Point Way to the west, and 80th Street Northeast to the south. This site, fifteen acres nestled within an urban environment, will be developed to support the use and storage of non-motorized boats (kayaks, canoes, and small sailboats) by the public. The project will also include other on-shore amenities for public use and provide opportunities to enjoy the waterfront. Building 27, a former hangar, Building 11, a former public works building, and Building 31 are located within the site. Changes to the interior functions and programming of Building 27 will not be included in the scope of this project. The design team plans to address many of the Design Guidelines set forth in the Sand Point- Magnuson Park Master Plan. These guidelines identify many opportunities for pedestrian improvements and plazas between the existing buildings and Lake Washington. The team also intends to encourage public participation in the design of the project to better address the needs and concerns of the community. The guidelines also call for extensive fencing around the boat storage and participation in the 1% for Art program. Due to the location of the site, the guidelines also recognize the need for a symbolic entrance or gateway to Sand Point Magnuson Park. The design of the North Shore

Recreation Area will be qualitative, rather than a simple provision of the requested improvements and changes.

The design team presented five schematic designs.

Scheme A- This scheme proposes an entrance and turn-around that directly access the main parking. Through this scheme, pedestrians will be able to access the shoreline without coming into contact with the vehicles. There would be two boat launches, and the beach would be expanded through a removal of a portion of Building 31. This scheme also incorporates a boat rental and teaching area.

Scheme B- The vehicular circulation through this scheme diverges in two directions at the entry. The pedestrian access to the shoreline is a tree-lined street that frames the view of Lake Washington. There would be some beach improvements through this scheme, and there would also be ADA accessibility accommodations for sailors as well.

Scheme C- Through this scheme, the vehicular circulation would be directed around Building 27 to the main parking area to the east of Building 27. There would be a small beach near this area. There would be three boat launches, and more boat storage than that of previous schemes. There would also be a plaza between Buildings 11 and 31.

Scheme D- This scheme incorporates parking on either side of Building 27, with entry access from each section of the parking. The intersections and loading areas would be paved, while the main parking would be treated with bio-filtration swales. These improvements would mitigate the harshness of the site. This scheme includes two new boat launches and retains an existing boat launch.

Scheme E- This scheme includes significant improvements and a grand gesture at the shoreline. The extent of the existing bulkhead would be developed as a beach, and the bulkhead would move back thirty feet. While there would be dead-end circulation along the east side of Building 11, there would be emergency vehicle access around the building.

The design team also presented a schematic floor plan for the north end of Building 11. While the building is currently in good condition, there would be some changes to the interior to incorporate programmatic changes. At the ground floor, there would be a reception area, storage and locker areas for clubs, and public restrooms with entry to the outside. The second floor would contain meeting space, banquet and concession space with kitchen support, and administrative offices located at the corner for maximum visibility of the site.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know why some of the five design alternatives presented contained more parking area than other schemes. Would like to know which size is more appropriate.
 - Proponents stated that previously, throughout the design of the initial schemes, the design team understood that National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) would use the area to the east of Building 27. Further stated that the shoreline edges need to be planned in conjunction with the parking.
- Would like to know why the environmental parking solution is not incorporated in every scheme.
 - Proponents stated that some type of stormwater filtration must be incorporated in every scheme. The bio-filtration system would be a visible landscape feature. The stormwater could also be filtered through hidden catchbasins.
- Urges the proponents to incorporate the visible bio-filtration system. Believes that this system would heighten the public's experience of this waterfront park.

- Would like to know how many parking stalls are required for this recreation area.
 - Proponents stated that there is no specific formula to calculate the number of parking stalls. Further stated that there would be, for example, 80 parking stalls included for 800 stored boats. Additional stalls (approximately 150-350) would be required to launch boats that are not stored at this location.
- Believes that artists work in many areas of this site would provide an additional opportunity to heighten the public's perception of this site. Believes that users moving through the site could become more aware of the environment through art that incorporates the wind, light, and views of the site.
 - Proponents stated that the team believes that the extensive visible boat storage fence would be a significant opportunity to incorporate artist work, creating a structure that is not purely functional.
- Recognizes that there are hard and soft launches in different locations in the various schemes. Would like to know how the team will identify the better qualities and strengths of each scheme.
 - Proponents stated that they would measure how well each scheme satisfies the design criteria. Further stated that the team would present the schemes to the public to determine the strengths of each scheme. Further stated that the team has examined the different circulation schemes, and prefers schemes that do not direct the circulation around the buildings. Further stated that the team has also compared the qualities of each scheme in terms of the amount and relationship between the soft and hard beach access.
- Appreciates the boulevard and the moved shoreline presented in Scheme B.
- Urges the proponents to recognize the significant existing art collection as the team develops the design.
- Urges the proponents to keep the existing windsurfing area.
- Would like to know what the surface of the boat storage area will be.
 - Proponents stated that it is currently paved. Further stated that the type of activity will determine the type of paving.
- Would like to know if there will be rowing facilities.
 - Proponents stated that they have communicated with different rowing groups, and these groups have said that the site is not compatible with this type of boat activity.

7 Dec 2000 Project: **Building 47 Community Center**
 Phase: Schematic Design
 Presenters: Eric Friedli, Sand Point- Magnuson Park Department of Parks and Recreation
 Rich Murakami, Arai Jackson Architects
 Attendees: Kevin Bergsrud, Sand Point- Magnuson Park (DOPAR)
 Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign
 Wendy Ceccherelli, Sand Point- Magnuson Park (DOPAR)
 Karen Daubert, Park Board
 Diane Hilmo, Sand Point- Magnuson Park- (DOPAR)
 Jan Oscherwitz, City Budget Office
 Karen Stanley, Arai Jackson Architects and Planners
 Mike Usen, EDAW, Inc.
 Helen Welborn, City Budget Office

Time: .5 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00205)

<p><i>Please Note:</i> <u><i>These actions must be reviewed and approved for the first time, as they were not formally taken during the meeting.</i></u></p>

Actions: **The Commission appreciates the thorough presentation and makes the following comments and recommendations:**

- **supports the proponents efforts to identify an “optimal” design concept with due public process to ensure long-term use of the building**
- **urges the team to incorporate environmentally sustainable design materials in addition to the proposed code required upgrades and**
- **urges the team to use life-cycle costing models securing financing for an up front investment in energy conservation measures to reduce long-term maintenance costs**
- **urges the team to improve the design of the theater to allow and promote a wide range of uses**

Building 47, located within the western area of Sand Point/ Magnuson Park, was originally constructed in 1941 as a two-story recreational building. It is a masonry load-bearing construction, and concrete, wood, and steel complete the palette of materials. The existing building contains a 700-seat theater, gymnasium, pool, and multi-purpose rooms. The client, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) will use this building as a community center, programming activities and musical presentations for senior citizens and children. The design team has been hired to make structural and mechanical improvements, upgrade finishes and design standards, and make interior programmatic changes to meet the DOPAR’s needs. The programmatic alterations will be minor modifications, and will be made relative to the budget requirements. Life safety upgrades and changes are the priority. The restrooms serving the recreation area and the auditorium will be renovated as well. While the theater, gymnasium, and pool will remain unchanged, the western fitness area will be reconfigured to accommodate

administration offices, meeting rooms, and multi-purpose rooms. The design team has also proposed an “optimal” concept that organizes the same programmatic requirements through a different, more expensive scheme. Through this scheme, the stage would extend beyond the orchestra pit. The projection room and green room would be improved as well. Also, the restrooms would be moved from the west wall to provide an opportunity for the introduction of more natural light.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know what types of materials will be used, and the maintenance requirements of these materials.
 - Proponents stated that the finishes would be selected from DOPAR’s palette of durable standards; DOPAR is currently updating their standards. The proponents have considered carpet, but many project proponents are also concerned about the durability and maintenance requirements of carpet. Further stated that the client is also concerned about wall finishes, and may incorporate a hard, durable surface to the wainscot, rather than standard wall covering.
- Would like to know if the exterior finishes are historically fixed.
 - Proponents stated that there would not be many changes to the exterior of the building.
- Would like to know if there will be any environmentally sustainable building changes to reduce maintenance costs.
 - Proponents stated that the building would be upgraded with shear walls to meet code requirements.
- Believes that the current theater design is difficult to program. Urges the proponents to pay careful attention to the renovation of the theater so it will be as multi-use as possible.
 - Proponents stated that the basic scheme includes a greenroom in the basement, behind the stage. Further stated that the stage size is not conducive to live theater, and acoustically, it is not acceptable. Further stated that many of the changes to the theater would be mechanical, rather than architectural. Proponents stated that they may offer the theater to be used, free of charge, to identify the way in which people may want to use the theater.
- Strongly urges the proponents to develop a viable theater out of the existing shell.
 - Proponents stated that the current budget will allow the code requirement upgrade, to even allow use of the theater. Further stated that, in the future, some areas currently programmed for the pool may be allocated for use by the theater.

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Jefferson Park Golf Maintenance Facility**
Phase: Schematic Design
Presenters: Wayne Ivary, Ivary and Associates
John Mallon, Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR)
Attendees: Jerry Arbes, Friends of Seattle Olmstead Parks
Don Bullard, (DOPAR)
Karen Daubert, Park Board
Amy Graaf, Seattle Housing Authority
Ron Gibbs, Seattle Golf
Robert Hinrix, Jefferson Park Alliance
Mark Holland, Jefferson Park Alliance
Pat Jackson, Jefferson Park Alliance
Anne Knight, Friends of Seattle Olmstead Parks
Mira Latoszek, Jefferson Park Alliance and Beacon Hill Council
Frederica Merrell
Jeff Saeger, Seattle Housing Authority
Jerry Suder, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU)
Jim Weir, Jefferson Park Golf

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00206)

Please Note: These actions must be reviewed and approved for the first time, as they were not formally taken during the meeting.

- Action:** The Commission appreciates the presentation and approves the design of the maintenance facility buildings only, but would like to review the site plan again, after certain concerns have been addressed:
- The Commission urges the proponents to put contiguous funding in place for this project to include the reconfiguration of the new path as well as the construction of the new facilities;
 - requests that the team develop graphic documentation illustrating the changes to existing circulation necessitated by the project, and any changes in the NBH neighborhood plan, if appropriate
 - urges the City to conduct a community meeting about the project design rather than a briefing limited to issues on siting on as soon as possible;
 - urges the proponents to address the community concerns, point by point, to ensure that this design and siting follows the circulation needs stipulated in by the North Beacon Hill neighborhood plan; and furthermore requests that a member of the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) be present at the next meeting to further explain the North Beacon Hill neighborhood plan and the dynamics of the neighborhood.
 - would like the landscape architects to attend the next Commission meeting to further explain the tree buffers, paving materials, and landscape design; and

The Jefferson Park Golf Course, on the east side of Beacon Avenue, is one of the City of Seattle's five golf facilities and is located on Beacon Hill. The scope of this project would include the renovation of two existing golf maintenance facilities in the northeast area of the site. These buildings, totaling 6,500 square feet, would contain the crew facilities and equipment storage. The project would include the construction of a new 4,700 square foot facility to meet code and provide acceptable maintenance accommodations for the golf course.

The development and implementation of this project has been through many stages. "In June 1995, the City signed an agreement with Municipal Golf of Seattle (MGS), a non-profit corporation, to operate the City golf courses and assume responsibility for all golf designated Cumulative Reserve Subfund (CRF funds) and for all capital improvements. In 1998, the Jefferson Park Alliance sought and obtained a moratorium on all golf course development at Jefferson Park while they developed a Jefferson Park Concept Plan to determine the siting of the new building. In October of 1998, Ivary and Associates was hired by MGS to conduct site analysis for the maintenance building." Through this process and continuing throughout Fall 2000, the schematic design of the project has developed in conjunction with public community meetings and different siting considerations under the advisement of the Board of Parks Commissioners. "Since September, 2000, Ivary and Associates has been working with Parks personnel, maintenance staff, landscape designers, community planners, and MGS staff in an effort to provide a schematic design that meets the project scope/ budget and is especially sensitive to the neighborhood concerns."

The proposed new building will meet the space requirements for the 27-hole golf course facility, as required by code, and would be located to the west of the two existing buildings. The design team has analyzed the use and costs of this facility to determine if these facilities can be combined with the horticultural building, or consolidated to be contained within a smaller area. Other siting considerations, the views to the northwest, have led the team to keep the development in the southern area of the site. The building would be buried into the bank as a buffer between the park area and the equipment storage yard. The design proposal includes some changes to the existing equipment storage buildings, constructed with a concrete base, translucent panels and siding, and heavy timber framing. The proposal also includes removal of the shed roofs and repainting to allow the buildings to blend in with the environment. The new 4,700 square foot building would include offices, crew space with restrooms, lockers, and a shop area to service the existing vehicles. This building has been designed using materials and construction similar to that of the existing buildings. Currently there is a path from Asa Mercer Middle School that meanders through the maintenance yard, which causes security problems. Through the proposed design, the path would be redirected to provide a connection between the school, the park, and the east-west trail to the community center.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- A member of the Jefferson Park Alliance expressed many concerns about this proposed project. This group feels that there is not a "Design Program with clear design objectives for the crew maintenance program, adjacent South Division program, general Park Department programming in Jefferson Park and community neighborhood planning goals." The group also believes that there are "inflated staffing assumptions." The group states that there is "confusion in project management and public involvement policies which create barriers to public review of design. To date, December 7, 2000, neither MGS nor the Parks Department have agreed to hold public design meetings for the project in

spite of numerous requests.” Jefferson Park Alliance believes that the current design does not meet the goals of the adopted North Beacon Hill neighborhood plan and the specific concept plan for Jefferson Park adopted the City Council.” The group believes that there will also be an “impact on significant historic features of the park associated with the Olmstead legacy.” The group is concerned that there is not a “landscape specialist on staff with the design firm, and there may be a significant loss of multiple mature cedars, firs and other trees on the site.” Jefferson Park Alliance believes that there should be “new landscaping to block the unsightly view of the facility from the north, east, and south.” They are concerned that there will be “blockage and possible elimination of bicycle and pedestrian circulation through the west side of the park.” The Jefferson Park Alliance is concerned that the “addition of fencing and lighting is in excess, beyond the amounts already present in the park.” Finally, they urged the Commissioners to examine and compare the existing nature of the circulation through the site with the proposed path. The existing path is paved, and the width allows bicycle and ADA access.

- Friends of Seattle’s Olmstead Parks is concerned about the impacts of the changes to the path. They are concerned that “the path will be enclosed in chain link fencing for approximately 500 feet combined with lack of good sight lines raises safety issues for users.” They also believe that the “path will need to be eight feet wide. It cannot run as shown without severely impacting tree roots at either end. A survey and advice of a tree specialist is needed.” Friends of Seattle’s Olmstead Parks is concerned that the new buildings will “cut off the original historic roadway/path. Also, the buildings would restrict park connections. The location of maintenance bins south of road requires road to be gated off, which constrains and impacts tree roots.” Friends of Seattle’s Olmstead Parks recommends that the maintenance bins be kept “north of road so the facility can be gated off along north side of road. They would also like to reconfigure the site plan to minimize impact on site and on pedestrian connection between ballfield and community center. Friends of Seattle’s Olmstead Parks urges a consideration of co-locating with Horticulture, at least the fueling station, if not more.”

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know how this proposal will change the current access and the community beyond the golf course.
 - Proponents stated that there is a maintenance service road that is also used by the Horticultural building. Portions of this road will be closed off, and people must access the Horticultural building by alternative directions. The path connecting the Asa Mercer Middle School to the community center will be simplified and changed as well, to cross the road through a single crosswalk. Proponents further stated that MGS has identified areas available for the new path, but there is no funding available for the landscaping improvements. Further stated that the Parks Board reviewed the siting options and approved this scheme. Further stated that there is public concern about three trees that may be removed.
- Would like to how the public comment and concerns have been addressed in the design process of this project. Would like to know if the team has agreed to hold public meetings.
 - Proponents stated that there has been a public hearing to analyze the siting options
- Would like to know if there will be public meetings to discuss the design beyond the narrow issue of siting

- Proponents stated that the team plans to brief the North Beacon Hill Community Council a final time before beginning construction.
- Feels that a briefing will not be adequate. Is concerned about the nature of the discussion between the community and the project proponents. Believes that a briefing before construction will not be sufficient to address the concerns that must be resolved.
- Urges the team to address the community's concerns of safety. Feels that the team should address community concerns that proposed construction will obstruct the existing path without commitment or funding to redirect the path.
- Believes that the community briefing should take place before schematic design is completed. Believes that the siting concerns are significant, while the buildings' design does not seem to be a primary concern.
- Urges the proponents to respond, in writing, to the Jefferson Park Alliance and Friends of Seattle's Olmstead Parks concerns and points before coming back to present the project to the Commission. Understands that there are constraints and concerns related to funding, but believes that this project has taken a piece-meal approach. Believes that these types of projects should be completed efficiently and in a cohesive process to ensure that the entire scope of the project will not disrupt the community at any point in time.
- Believes that the proponents have only considered the maintenance facility in the scope of this project, and the golf course is the only client whose needs are being considered. Urges DOPAR, as a champion of neighborhood plans, to address the needs of the larger public and other people who are concerned about the park and affected by its design.
 - Proponents stated that the concept plan was approved by the neighborhood in March of 1999. Further stated that, through this plan, the maintenance facility, the short nine, and the driving range are going to remain in their current location. Through this siting process, there have been at least four public meetings with area stakeholder groups in the community. Further stated that a public relations firm was hired to coordinate the public process. Further stated that through this siting, the golf course provides a buffer between the maintenance facility and the neighborhood. As the proponents examined the siting impacts of these facilities, the team identified areas of the golf course in which they would not be removing existing features. Proponents further stated that they have participated in a public process to site these facilities. The proponents believe that the concerned neighborhood groups have agreed that this site least impacts the neighborhood in regards to noise, lighting, and equipment operation. Further stated that the path relocation is not the responsibility of the MGS assignment.
- Does not object to the siting strategy but rather to its articulation.
- Encourages the team to engage the community in dialogue, rather than a briefing, to resolve the concerns about the path and the trees, so the community realizes that the project design is not complete.
- Commends the architects for the remodel and new facility design.
- Urges the proponents to reconsider the need for a fence near the edge of the short nine, to avoid the creation of a closed corridor.

- Proponents stated that patrons must pay to access this facility and people should not be allowed to wander onto the facility.

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Rainier Vista Housing Redevelopment**

Phase: Street Vacations Briefing

Previous Review: 20 April 2000 (Scope Briefing)

Presenters: Kim Lokan, Tonkin/ Hoyne/ Lokan

Jeff Saeger, Seattle Housing Authority

Attendees: Beverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation (SeaTran)

Jeff Foster, GGLO Architects

Ketil Freeman, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU)

Amy Graaf, Seattle Housing Authority

Moir Gray, SeaTran

Marilyn Senour, SeaTran

Time: 1hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC0161)

Action: The Commission supports this vacation proposal, an improvement of the existing conditions, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

- urges the proponents to show the existing topography and utility lines in relation to the proposed street grid to explain and clarify the context
- encourages the proponents to coordinate with Seattle Transportation to address their street width concerns, and is generally supportive of narrower streets as proposed to create a safer more intimate scale
- urges the proponents to work with SEATRAN to develop the design (perhaps through safety islands) of the South Martin Luther King Jr. Way pedestrian crossings to ensure safe links throughout the community
- looks forward to this project becoming a model of thoughtful development and design of large-scale residential projects.

The Rainier Vista Housing Redevelopment project, funded by Hope VI grants, is located approximately 3.5 miles south of Seattle, on Beacon Hill. The Commission previously reviewed the master plan and project design guidelines, which were developed to create a truly integrated neighborhood village. Since that presentation, the team has conducted four Design Review Board meetings and many community group meetings to address some concerns regarding resident relocation during construction, the means by which a private developer can develop this site, and the impacts of the Sound Transit station.

The master plan of the site incorporates many changes and will require street vacations. The existing streets, which intersect South Columbia Way and South Martin Luther King Jr. Way, are curvilinear. The changes, through this master plan, would integrate this housing development with the existing street grid and connect with the context and surrounding neighborhood streets. This configuration would also provide residents with a strong connection to South Martin Luther King Jr. Way, a major arterial. The pedestrian crossing at this street will be improved to address safety concerns. The street design extends and replicates the existing complex. The width will allow parallel parking on either side of the street, with a single lane for traffic flow. This narrow street will promote the “eyes on the street” and will slow down traffic. There will also be wider streets in the higher density, southern area of the site where public and mixed-use buildings will be located. The street grid will also respond to the steep topography with gradual curves at some intersections, rather than 90’ curves. Parks of varying sizes will be centrally located in the development, providing an amenity for the community.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if the proponents have coordinated with Sound Transit any future changes planned for South Martin Luther King Jr. Way.
 - Proponents stated that the intersection at South Dakota Street will be changed to become a four legged intersection, rather than the current three legged intersection. Further stated that members of Sound Transit are working with Arai Jackson Architects to develop streetscape improvements. The proponents have also proposed parallel parking on South Martin Luther King Jr. Way.
- Would like to know if the proposed commercial space of the Rainier Vista housing redevelopment will compete with the transit oriented development near the proposed Sound Transit Edmunds Station and the historic commercial district of Columbia City.
 - Proponents stated that the commercial area will be zoned NC-40, which will restrict the size of the retail within the commercial spaces.
- Would like to know if the proponents have addressed previous community concerns.
 - Proponents stated that previously, the community was primarily concerned about the proposed building heights. Zoning was changed in response to that concern.
- Would like to know if the proponents have compared the amount of open space of this development with the open space provided throughout Seattle.
 - Proponents stated that the open space in this development exceeds the guidelines of the Parks Comprehensive Plan.
- Is concerned that there is excessive open space, creating a housing development that is similar to a suburban model. Believes that the significant housing needs outweigh the need for open space. Urges the proponents to develop a balance between the housing and open space.
 - Proponents stated that the number of units is compliant with the need identified by the community. Currently there are 480 units, and this development will more than double this; the current plan calls for 1010 units.
- Is enthusiastic about the design as it is responsive to both the urban fabric and the typography. Believes the various types of open space will be a wonderful place for children. Would like the proponents to explain how the community will connect with and be linked across South Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Would like to know the typical speed of the traffic on South Martin Luther King Jr. Way, and how the traffic along this dividing road will be calmed.
 - Proponents stated that there will be traffic signals at Oregon Street, Genesee Street, and Dakota Street in addition to Alaska St. and Andover St. Further stated that there will be landscaping and other improvements to deter people from going in the wrong direction. The team has designed traffic calming street improvements within the neighborhood, but changes to South Martin Luther King Jr. Way must be planned by Seattle Transportation (SeaTran) and Sound Transit.
- Would like to know if the proposed housing development plan will promote social equity and a healthy vibrant neighborhood. Is concerned about zoning differences relative to the topography of the site. Would like to know if the lower-income units will be in the valley, and the market-rate

housing will be above.

- Proponents stated that the zoning changes are not related to the types of future residents. The zoning changes respond the protection of views throughout the area. Further stated that the team has been working with the residents to better integrate public housing in the neighborhood.
- Would like to know how, programmatically, the rental and for-sale units will be divided. Would like to know if there will be a differentiation in the design of the two types of units.
 - Proponents stated that ideally, the types of units will be distributed evenly throughout this neighborhood. Further stated that there will be no differentiation between the design of the rental and the for-sale units. There will be an even distribution of townhouse condominiums in the denser areas of the neighborhood.
- Would like to know what the design team has done to avoid creating a community that appears to be part of a master plan, and built at one time.
 - Proponents stated that Tonkin Hoyne Lokan has developed that Master Plan for Rainier Vista Housing Redevelopment, and different architects have designed the individual units, to create unique and individual units. Further stated that Design Guidelines were developed for the design of the units.
- Appreciates the responsive master plan design. Encourages the team to develop a means by which this community will be developed over time, in phases. Believes that there should be a detailed matrix and schedule, in addition to the drawings.
- A representative from SeaTran stated that they support these vacations that reinstate the traditional street grid. Believes that this design, similar to New Holly Park, will be successful and will help to improve the connection between this community and the surrounding neighborhood. Is concerned about the narrow street widths. Typically, streets widths are related to density and use, and hopes that these streets will be sufficient.
- Believes that narrow streets create a better sense of community. Would like to know how the parking will be addressed for the multi-family units.
 - Proponents stated that there will be alley parking or parking under the units, with on-street parking for additional cars and visitors

07 Dec 2000 Commission Business

ACTION ITEMS

A. TIMESHEETS

B. MINUTES FROM 02 NOVEMBER 2000

ANNOUNCEMENTS

C. COMMISSION HOLIDAY GATHERING, DEC 21ST

DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. HISTORIC CAROUSEL AT WOODLAND PARK ZOO
UPDATE/ MAXWELL-THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE DESIGN
DEVELOPMENT OF THE HISTORIC CAROUSEL AT WOODLAND
PARK ZOO. THE COMMISSION APPRECIATED THE TEAM'S
RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS CONCERNS ABOUT THE SITING AND
ANTICIPATED USE OF THIS PROJECT. THE DESIGN TEAM MADE
MANY CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO THESE CONCERNS:

THE CAROUSEL HAS BEEN PULLED BACK FROM THE
SLOPE OF THE TOPOGRAPHY.

THE DESIGN TEAM PULLED BACK THE ENTRIES TO THE
PARTY ROOMS.

THE CURB MATCHES THE GEOMETRY OF THE BUILDING
WALL.

THE CAROUSEL ENCLOSURE IS OPEN AT THE EDGE TO
ALLOW FREE FLOW OF TRAFFIC.

THERE IS A SLOT WINDOW UNDER THE EAVE TO ALLOW
LIGHT IN TO REFLECT OFF THE CEILING.

E. PARKS COMMUNITY CENTER PROJECT STEERING GROUP
AND JEFFERSON PARK ADVISORY TEAM/ CUBELL

F. OPEN SPACE STRATEGY SELECTION PANEL/ RAHAIM

G. CHAIR POSITION/ RAHAIM

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Southwest Precinct**
Phase: Construction Documents
Previous Review: 16 September 1999 (Briefing), 2 December 1999 (Conceptual), 6 April 2000 (Schematic Design), 17 August 2000 (Design Development)
Presenters: Kay Kirkpatrick, Artist
Rich Murakami, Arai Jackson Architects and Planners
Juliet Vong, Hough Beck and Baird
Attendees: Steve Arai, Arai Jackson Architects and Planners
Dale Draw, Seattle Police Department
Tony Gale, Executive Services Department
Teresa Rodriguez, Executive Services Department
Ruri Yampolsky, Seattle Arts Commission
Time: .75 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00117)

Action: The Commission approves the Construction Documents phase of this project and would like to make the following comments:

- **suggests that the art concept design could still be enriched if actual landscape elements were employed**
- **feels that the art design at the public corner of the building will be a strong element and link to the community**
- **commends the proponents for the successful integration of the perimeter fence with the site and landscape design while still meeting safety needs of building users**

Southwest Precinct, located on West Delridge Way, will be in the southeast corner of an existing K-Mart parking lot. This building, a 28,000 square foot, two-story building, has been designed to clearly define the public areas and access of the site. The design reflects the dichotomy of this precinct that must welcome the community but provide a sanctuary for the police officers as well. Programmatically, the police functions are located in the north area of the building, while the public areas are in the south area of the building. The design team has responded to previous Commission concerns through the building, landscape, and art design.

The southeast corner of the building has been softened and will be inviting. The cast concrete panels, applied to the wall, will have punched opening, and will also represent nearby Longfellow Creek through sand-blasted patterns. The design team has also developed a vertical landmark that will be at this corner. The roof has been extended to wrap down the south side of the building. There will be glazing around the west corner of the building to allow a view of the activities taking place inside.

As the Seattle Police Department (SPD) has explained, security is a significant concern of this precinct design. The police parking area is adjacent to the K-Mart parking area, and access between these two areas must be restricted; pedestrians should not be permitted to cross this site. While SPD expressed a need for a six foot-tall high fence around the site, K-Mart has expressed concern that this would be a significant barrier, and the police precinct would become a fortress. The landscape design and segmented fence will soften this edge. The edge around this site will alternate between earth berm buffers and segments of fences of varying heights. SPD and K-Mart have accepted this design; further changes would require further negotiation. The landscape architect has developed a full palette of

materials to supplement this edge. In areas where the minimum fence height is used, the landscape architect has proposed dense and thorny plants. The landscape architect has also focused on the landscape design of the public area of the precinct. There will be boulders, a water feature, ornamental grasses, and wetland vegetation to reflect the context of Longfellow Creek. The trees will also reflect the art design; a small grove of birches will be stark against the backdrop of the gray building. The shrubs and groundcover at the south edge of the site reflect the context.

The art program has also developed to reflect the natural context of the site through a variety of materials and textures. The water pattern of the stream, through an abstract reference to fingerprints, will be visible on the fritted lightweight glass on the windows of the public entry. The artist has also recognized the current precinct's police force request to replace an existing deceased police officer marker in the new design. This marker will be in the form of large bronze maple leaves, a symbol of officers falling in the line of duty. There will also be a banded group of trees gathered together and leaning against each other to form a symbolic sanctuary above the reception desk. At night, the image of the trees will also be projected on the facade of the building, through light.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if police officers had any comments or concerns about this design.
 - Proponents stated that the SPD did not have any negative comments about this design, and the police officers were happy that the memory marker was included in the design.
- Appreciates the design changes to the massing of the southeast corner and the landscape design integration with the building and art program design. Would like to know if the falling bronze leaves will be mounted flush to the side of the building.
 - Proponents stated that the leaves would be placed to provide some variety. Agreed that some leaves could be protruding near the roof of the building, to provide some depth, but the team does not want to create a climbing wall.
- Supports the proponents' design decisions to address the security concerns of SPD. Would like the proponents to describe the fence material and design.
 - Proponents stated that the fence will be installed in four-foot segments, and the fence will be vinyl coated chain-link fence, with an interesting transition as it meets the landscape.
- Urges the proponents to consider other fence systems.
- Would like to know if there is lighting in the K-Mart parking lot.
 - Proponents stated that there are standard pole-mounted lights with 3 foot-candles, in addition to security cameras.
- Urges the artist to continue to take clues from the surrounding natural environment and directly integrate and use this environment. Hopes the art design will interpret the landscape with actual landscape.
- Commends the team for their response to previous concerns. Believes that the successful functioning of this building is the primary guideline for this design.

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Civic Center/ City Hall**

Phase: Discussion

Previous Review: 2 December 1999 (Scope Briefing), 16 March 2000 (City Hall/ Schematic Design Concept), 20 April 2000 (Open Space Conceptual Design), 18 May 2000 (Concept Briefing), 17 August 2000 (Schematic Design), 21 September 2000 (Schematic Design), 2 November 2000 (Client Group Meeting), 16 November 2000 (Discussion)

Presenters: Peter Bohlin, Bohlin, Cywinski Jackson
Marilyn Brockman, Bassetti/ Bohlin Cywinski Jackson

Attendees: see attached

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00119)

Action: The Commission appreciates the presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

- **approves the design team's response to some issues and concerns presented in Council's resolution on the project and previous Commission meetings**
- **believes that the changes have successfully satisfied points 1, 6, and 7 of the City Council resolution**
- **appreciates the design team's effort to develop alternative building and elevation designs, believing that the building will become even more significant with further refinement of details**
- **supports the Land Use code waiver at the northeast corner of the building to accommodate "bay" window element over corner entry**
- **would like to see detailed elevations and plans of the 5th Avenue arcade and the southeast corner before approving that aspect of the design**
- **urges the design team to reexamine programmatic areas along James Street to create greater transparency**
- **supports the latest rendition of the entry sequence from the corner of Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street, but at future presentations, would like to see drawing details describing the way by which the architecture and landscape architecture come together.**

The City Hall design team met in the second of a series of four meeting to discuss lingering Commission concerns about the schematic design of City Hall. The team has made specific changes in response to previous Commission concerns. Through this meeting the team further addressed the building elevations, the function and characteristics of the open space, the entry sequence and circulation through the building, an examination of the need for Land Use waivers, and the Boards and Commissions room. CityDesign has also convened Focus Group meetings with the design team and other interested parties, to further address programming concerns raised by the City Council resolution. These meetings have identified the need to manage the open space, to ensure the successful use and character of the open space.

The design team continued the fruitful and constructive conversation about the project and the importance of addressing the design and use of the full site. The design of the Fifth Avenue façade has developed to become accessible and open. This façade would resonate with the future Justice Center across the street through the width of the façade and the stone cladding. While the stone created more of a barrier to the public, the area of stone has been reduced to create a glazed façade that will not be imposing. The character of this circulation and access arcade must extend to the corner of Cherry Street

and Fifth Avenue to offer a strong connection to Key Tower. Copper louvers have also been introduced to the north elevation; the copper stretches around the corner to accentuate the entry to the arcade at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Cherry Street. The ceilings of the arcade will be wood. The relationship between the stone cladding and the glazing has been modified to provide depth and shadows that continue around the corner to create a strong, transparent light well entry to the west, marking the elevator, adjacent to the hillclimb assist. Delicate light shelves have also been applied to the west façade to allow indirect light into the offices. The plinth below City Hall, facing Fourth Avenue, will not be fully clad in the stone of the office building above. The plinth will be composed of a layering of opaque and transparent glass using the family of elegant materials of the office block elevations.

The City Hall design team will present elevations to the Commission at the January 4, 2001 Commission meeting to fully illustrate the team's intent to request some Land Use Code waivers. The first addresses the desire to project the bay at the corner of Fifth Avenue and Cherry Street beyond the allowable building edge. The team would also like to request a waiver for the south façade and the transparency requirements. The design has developed to include large areas of glass, but the full area of this glass is not transparent; some of the glazing is composed of opaque glass.

The Boards and Commissions rooms has changed to respond to previous concerns as well. The room includes a screen to shield the window where spaces are activated. While the upper terrace connects to Cherry Street efficiently, the terrace at this corner must ramp up to a steeper slope at James Street. The team has opened and enriched this corner by removing the corner and installing a window. The Boards and Commissions room is in this corner, and this bay window could become a niche within the room. The new room would also be significantly larger than the existing room.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to see fully detailed elevations before granting approval for Land Use Code waivers. Believes that the projection at Fifth Avenue and Cherry Street strengthens the corner. Is not yet convinced that the waiver for the transparency requirements would be justified for the edge along James Street. Urges the team to fully examine the program behind this wall to develop a more transparent façade.
 - Proponents stated that they would bring plans and elevations to the next Commission presentation. Further stated that the transparent and opaque glass along this façade will be layered.
- Commends the team for the elevation design changes. Believes that the tension created between the transparency and the mass is successful, as well as the two vertical elements on opposite corners of the office block. Is concerned about the lack of variation in the arcade along Fifth Avenue; does not believe that this design will encourage people to enter. Is least comfortable with the arcade and the lack of variation in the design.
 - Proponents stated that they would like to complete design development. The arcade will not change in significant ways, but there will be many small changes. Further stated that there is also a four-foot grade change that is not easily apparent through the drawings, which will promote people to enter, as the grade will flatten at the actual entry.
- Is encouraged by the changes and believes that the proportions create strong expressions of significant areas of the building.

- Proponents stated that, for a City Council action that will take place on January 17, 2001, the team does need formal recommendation, support, and approval for the design team's response to the previous City Council resolution.
- Hopes that there will be some room for storage in the Boards and Commissions room. Believes that the space provided in the larger scheme would provide significant flexibility.

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Civic Center Open Space and Art Plan**
Phase: Discussion
Previous Review: 2 December 1999 (Scope Briefing), 16 March 2000 (City Hall/ Schematic Design Concept), 20 April 2000 (Open Space Conceptual Design), 18 May 2000 (Concept Briefing), 17 August 2000 (Schematic Design), 21 September 2000 (Schematic Design), 2 November 2000 (Client Group Meeting), 16 November 2000 (Discussion)
Presenters: Kathryn Gustafson, Gustafson Partners
Barbara Swift, Swift and Company Landscape Architects

07 Dec 2000 Project: **Civic Center Open Space and Art Plan**
Attendees: Geri Beardsley, Council Staff
Sergei Bischak, Bohlin, Cywinski Jackson
Beliz Brother, Artist
Marty Curry, Seattle Planning Commission
Patrick Doherty, DCLU
Tony Gale, Executive Services Department (ESD)
Barbara Goldstein, Seattle Arts Commission
Ken Johnsen, Shiels Oblatz Johnsen
Rick Krochalis, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU)
Monica Lake, ESD
Jay Lazerwitz, Seattle Arts Commissioner
Meg McNeil, Shiels Oblatz Johnsen
Brian Pavlovec, KPFF Consulting Engineers
Victoria Reed, Arcade Magazine
David Spiker, Hewitt Architects
Jerry Suder, DCLU
Barbara Swift, Swift and Company Landscape Architects
Kelly Walker, Arcade Magazine
Ruri Yampolsky, Seattle Arts Commission

Time: 2 hours (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00139)
(SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00143)

Action: none

The open space and landscape design team presented a discussion of the open space as an entire piece. Many of the concerns have been addressed through previous discussion with the City Hall design team. Further discussion with the landscape architects focussed on the walls along Cherry and James Streets and initial thoughts and ideas about plant materials. A full discussion of the open space design will continue in the January 4, 2001 meeting.

The initial significant schematic concept placed City Hall upon a plinth. This plinth extends around the edge to connect to the future Justice Center through four major elements. The paving materials on the sidewalk and crosswalks would extend throughout the entire Civic Center site, stretching from the Public Safety building to Key Tower. Also, the street trees and water feature would provide visual connection

throughout these sites. Finally, the vertical walls of City Hall, the Justice Center, and the walls of the landscaping and open space would be clad in the same stone. This five to ten inch coursing stone would become the plinth of the buildings, wrapping around the entire building. The team has developed the James Street elevation, to determine the frequency at which the wall steps down, to create different areas that terrace down along the open space. There will be hedges and branching trees along this edge. The team has also proposed a planter for climbing vines in the seam of the sidewalk along Cherry Street to inhabit the walls and frame the entrances. The design team has also proposed to use ginkgoes for street trees and trees on the terraces. They have also proposed to use magnolias throughout other areas of the open space. The team has spoken with Seattle Transportation (SeaTran) about the street improvements and the textured faces of these edge walls. Along James Street, these wall segments curve down to meet the slope of the sidewalk, creating a dynamic condition for those walking near this edge. This hedge language is also reflected on Cherry Street through the planters, with plant materials of various colors and textures that will activate these spaces throughout all seasons. The team also believes that, in addition to the incomplete architectural element, there should be a design gesture at the corner of Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street, to provide intimacy to this space with the wonderful view. This gesture, perhaps a pergola, should contain hanging plants or other materials that grow on an arbor, to provide variety and seasonal shade.

The team compared the scale and sizes of the different open spaces with well-known open spaces to show that these open spaces are very intimate and protected. There will also be a water feature, with ¼” of water on which people will be able to walk. This wet surface will reflect light at night, creating another animation of the space. The grade changes and terraces will also create the desired intimacy of these open spaces.

The entry sequence from Fourth Avenue into the building has changed as well. The team presented additional drawings to further explain the scale and character of the element at Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street, although the design has not changed significantly. The team would also like feedback to identify the logical hillclimb entrance to Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street from within the building. The team showed that the elevator and stair core can be very apparent from across the street through the use of natural light and other animation. From street level, the two story structure at this corner is also very visible. The space within this structure will be proportionally comfortable, and will have a rain canopy and roll-up doors. This area would be a separate place access from the main circulation of this terrace that overlooks the plaza. The public path to the elevator and hillclimb must also be clear even when the building is closed.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Appreciates the notion that the components of the Civic Center are connected by materials, but would like to discuss the connections by use. Believes that the discussion of scale and intimacy does address some of these concerns, but would like to know the intended uses, and if these uses and spaces will be open to the street.
- For the January 4, 2001 Commission meeting, would like to address this concern as well as the mid-block connection on Fourth Avenue.
 - Proponents stated that scale is about use, and it is important to understand what uses would fit in these spaces, and how these uses would be transparent from the street. Further stated that there are many entries to the open space, like a sieve.
- Appreciates the scale comparisons, but is concerned that the grand stair may be too large in comparison to the intimate spaces.

- Proponents stated that, knowing the scale of these spaces from the beginning, the stair will participate in the mixture of uses along the open space.
- Is concerned that the initial stair parti has created an island at the corner of Fourth Avenue and James Street, a problem that is camouflaged through landscaping.
 - Proponents stated that this island will provide intimate spaces and refuge areas. Further stated the views from the perches primarily focus into the Civic Center block, rather than the King County building.
- Is concerned that the views to Elliot Bay will be blocked by buildings to the west.
- Would like the proponents to explain the experience and usability of certain areas of the open spaces, especially in relation to the spaces under the grand stair. Would like to know if it is intended to be a place where people simply pass through, or if it is intended to be connected to Fourth Avenue. Would like to know if there is a barrier at mid-block, due to the water feature.
 - Proponents stated that from the street, the access to the open space is visibly transparent, with many ways and options to enter the space. Further stated that there should be tables with chairs to connect to the Cultural Café, creating an intimate corner with a promenade in front.
- Would like to know the conditions of the intersection of the sun wall and the grand stair.
 - Proponents stated that they have conducted shadow studies and this space will be in shadow until noon. Further stated that this space is approximately fifteen feet clear. Further stated that the public events and spaces under the building, behind the sun wall, will be visible to this space.
- Does not believe that the interior space extending toward the corner of Fourth Avenue and James Street should house mechanical and electrical equipment. If there is sufficient head clearance, believes that the public space behind the sun wall should extend to this location. Believes that this might eliminate the need for Land Use code waivers.
 - Proponents agreed that this might provide an opportunity to bring light down into this space, under the stairs.
- Believes that the uses programmed for the structure along James Street, which is currently the mechanical room or building manager, should be public uses at grade. Realizes that this would require more re-design. Believes that the current design creates more blank walls.
 - Proponents stated that this space could be occupied, and this space could be accessed from James Street.
- Urges that the team to develop uses for this space. Does not believe that this space needs to be programmed to be designed. Feels that the desired activity level should be visible from the surrounding streets. Believes that the activity of the open spaces will only be visible from the center of the block along Fourth Avenue.
 - Proponents stated that the design promotes different levels of privacy and activity throughout the open space. Further stated that it would be feasible to glaze and provide access to the structure at the corner of Fourth Avenue and James Street.
- Would like the proponents to design usable space, regardless of the specific use is.

- Would like to see an exploration of these ideas and the opportunities for different compositions of openings and access to activate this space.
 - Proponents stated that they must include supporting uses to an exterior plaza, these uses must face the plaza, rather than another direction. It must feed the activities of the central location.
- Does not believe that this is a problem that should be solved by the design team. Believes that the client must state that there needs to be activity at this corner.
- A representative from the Department of Design Construction and Land Use (DCLU) stated that the Council resolution did designate the need for more pedestrian activity on James Street.
- Believes that animation is not solely doors and windows. Believes that this animation could be provided by a certain level of relief on the wall, promoting shadows and texture. Urges the design team to explore a broader definition of animation.
 - Proponents stated that this could be an opportunity to investigate different ways to bring light into the building. Proponents agreed that this space could be an opportunity to create significant civic expression.
- Appreciates the plinth as a unifying theme of the project. Appreciates the expression of the plant materials; these are true to the notion of creating a minimal simple design that represents the Northwest. At the next presentation, hopes that the proponents will further discuss the variation of intimate, small scale spaces and large scale spaces through clear drawings. Hopes that there are intimate places within the larger open space that people can inhabit.
 - Proponents stated that the program stopped at City Hall. Further stated that the team has been going underneath the plaza and creating new spaces to form a building landscape piece.
- Does not believe that the space behind the sun wall should be a lobby. Feels that this space should host activities and usable space that could spill out into the plaza. Believes that without proper management, the sun wall will be closed more often than it is open.
 - Proponents stated that the sun wall will not be a weather-sealed wall. The wall should be secure, but it will not be perfectly air-tight. Proponents stated that there are systems that can be set to sense rain, temperature, and light. The doors could be linked to a mechanism on a cable system.
- Feels that the entry sequence from the corner of Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street successfully provides a number of elements within a single space. Believes that the natural light and artificial light will draw people to the entry in a wonderful way. Is concerned about the definition of the retail spaces within this location.
 - Proponents stated that there are certain aspects of the building that must be resolved, as the team needs to move forward with the design. Further stated that the entry sequence must be set, before the retail concerns are addressed. The entry sequence will guide how this space is used.
- Is not convinced that the users, viewing the building from across the street, will be able to identify which door should be used to enter the hillclimb. Believes that the single set of doors between the commercial space and the sun wall is not obvious.

- Proponents stated the sun wall should be the front door. The sun wall will sweep out to draw people inside.
- Hopes that the detailing of the entry at the corner at Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street differentiates it from the sun wall, the front door. Hopes that people will not have to wonder which door they should enter.
- Would like the team to carefully consider the entry at the southwest corner of the office block. Believes that if people approach the building from Fourth Avenue to enter at mid-block, there should also be a significant and apparent entry through the sun wall, even when the doors are closed.
 - Proponents stated that the raw space at the corner of Fourth Avenue and Cherry Street have become and will further become a wonderful opportunity.

